US Army Corps of Engineers

HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
OFFICE OF DEPUTY COMMANDING GENERAL FOR CIVIL WORKS AND
OFFICE OF DEPUTY COMMANDING GENERAL FOR MILITARY PROGRAMS

PROGRAMS MANAGEMENT NEWS

VOLUME III ISSUE 1 JAN / FEB 2000

This Publication Is Issued On A Bi-Monthly Basis.

STEVE'S NOTE

I'm pleased to inform you that the latest draft of the "Quality Management" Engineer Regulation is now ready for your review on the HQUSACE website at the following location: www.hq.usace.army.mil/qm. This regulation will redefine **quality** for ALL of USACE, and applies to all functional areas. The new definition transcends the historical definition of quality based solely on 'technical product quality.'

The intent is to empower our employees with the authority and responsibility for delivering quality products and services to our clients in accordance with the Project Management Business Process (PMBP). This regulation views everything we do as a project and every employee as a team member.

Please take a few minutes to visit the website and read the draft regulation. You can submit comments via the website. We are interested in your viewpoints.

Stephen Browning, P.E.
Chief, Programs Management Division
Office of Deputy Commanding General
for Military Programs §

IN THIS ISSUE

FRED'S NOTE

As you have no doubt heard by now, the Chief has announced a restructuring of the headquarters. This long-awaited move is (as I view it) one of the final pieces of an overall initiative that he started some time ago which has involved every element of the Corps and is aimed at positioning us to be relevant and competitive in this century. We can't afford to be the "best buggy whip manufacturers" in the future.

There is a temptation to focus mostly on the structural part of the reorganization. That, however, would miss the far more significant part of the change. In fact, the headquarters presently has many fewer people in it than it had just a couple of years ago, and I don't see any significant additional downsizing coming. This downsizing has come through concerted action over that time period. We have, though, changed several organizational boxes and rewired the structure – but these changes will mostly allow us to function with the downsized "body count."

The change that has far more import relates to the business process changes associated with the new structure. With specific respect to Civil Works, these can be summarized as follows:

1. We will extend the PMBP concept to the HQ. You have made this transition already. It's time for us to catch up.

2. Implement a multi-discipline team approach to business. See point one above.

3. Better link and align legislative and appropriations objectives.

4. Clarify responsibilities among the CW divisions. Specifically, assign one division with the responsibility for program development and execution and another with a focus on authorities, practices and principles/policies to position the Corps to effectively meet future national needs. Again, these two divisions must be linked and aligned.

5. Appoint a single POC here for every action moving at the Washington level. Similar to the way PMs function at the district level, this person will be the primary, but not necessarily sole, point of contact.

6. Change the focus of HQ involvement in project formulation from that of end-of-the-process, after-the-fact review to one of early and continuous input. Offer this in a consultative and assistance mode. The goal is to avoid discovering basic problems late in the process when delays are then inevitable.

7. Change the current HQ mindset from a "regulatory" one to working with you to get to "yes."

We have some other complementary business process changes also pending in response to a House requirement contained in its report on FY 2000 appropriations that will help even more. I'm personally excited about all of the changes and believe they will result in the most positive improvement I've seen in my 30 years with the Corps. It's fun to be able to look forward again to a positive future.

Fred Caver, P.E.
Chief, Programs Management Division
Office of Deputy Commanding General
for Civil Works §

DRAFT ENGINEER REGULATION (ER) XXXX-XX, *QUALITY MANAGEMENT*

We are testing an automated online review process with this draft on the HQUSACE website at the following Uniform Resource Locator (URL): www.hq.usace.army.mil/qm. You can view the text of the ER, as well as read and post comments on it, all on this website. Please be sure to make yourself available to review and comment on the **new quality management philosophy** expressed in this draft. Please use the website for submitting all **comments by 1 March 2000**.

The team that developed this document plans to conduct "on-board" review meetings at each MSC later this spring, to discuss the concept and respond to comments received. We'll be coordinating with the MSC to set up those sessions.

Please pass this on to all those you believe will be involved in the quality process--that's about everyone!! §

THE ASSESSMENT OF THE US ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS (USACE) PROGRAMS AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT (PM) PROCESSES

The Logistics Management Institute (LMI) has established a working website which provides information on the *Assessment of USACE Programs and Project Management (PM) Processes*, Task Order CE 904. One of the primary objectives of this task order is to diagram standard generic PM business processes for major Corps programs. The Logistics Management Institute is a private, nonprofit corporation that provides management consulting, research, and analysis to governments and other nonprofit organizations.

The website can be accessed at the following Uniform Resource Locator (URL): http://globe.lmi.org/usace/. The site shows LMI's interpretation of the Project Management Business Process (PMBP) for Civil Works, Military and HTRW projects, as these processes exist today. The next step for LMI is to diagram the "to be" process, showing recommended improvements. Keep in mind that the website is continuously evolving and the charts are being updated based on the input received.

Please feel free to look at the website. §

WE HAVE LIFT OFF - DECOMMISSIONING NASA'S ONLY REACTOR

By: Mark D. Kessinger, CELRH-PM-P

The Corps recently received the go ahead from NASA to decommission the agency's only nuclear reactor and like a countdown to lift off, the process to attaining command of a project such as this was an orchestration of precise and deliberate steps. At the root of this was the development of a well-rounded and experienced inter-district team through the Huntington District's project management system. The importance of a strong central management and the ability to generate coherence across districts becomes very evident in a situation where the task at hand is so great that it requires more than the faculties any one district can provide. Because this Corps team had cohesion, it earned the helm of a task that carries with it not only technical challenges and prestige, but also a long-standing historical significance.

NASA's Plum Brook Station is located about 50 miles west of Cleveland in Sandusky, Ohio, and is a field test facility for the Glenn Research Center in Cleveland. Plum Brook Station was originally established during World War II as a Department of Defense explosives manufacturing plant. Following WWII, the site was turned over to GSA and remained vacant until 1955, when NASA acquired it. NASA purchased the site because the Glenn Research Center is surrounded by residential areas and Plum Brook's 6,400 acres provided the required clear zones for safely conducting potentially dangerous aerospace tests involving liquid fueled rockets and materials for nuclear-powered propulsion systems.

The Plum Brook Reactor Facility consists of a 60 megawatt thermal materials test reactor which was

constructed in 1963 and a 100 kilowatt thermal mock up reactor constructed in 1960. The facilities operated in support of NASA programs until they were shut down in 1973. A decommissioning effort was completed in July 1973 that included removal of all nuclear fuel from the site, decontamination of selected equipment, and placement of all systems in safe and secure storage. In response to NASA's request, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) changed the facility's operating licenses to "possess but not operate" status. In 1997, the NRC asked NASA to complete a Decommissioning Plan for the Plum Brook Reactor Facility by the end of 1999 and to complete decommissioning of the reactor by 2007. NASA agreed to this schedule in 1998.

In February 1999, NASA contracted the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' to complete the first step in the decommissioning process - develop the Decommissioning Plan for the Plum Brook Reactor Facility. To accomplish this challenging task the corps needed to draw upon its own experience and expertise throughout the agency and from its contractors. The Corps assembled an integrated team of Federal employees and contractors with broad experience in developing decommissioning plans and coordinating their approval with the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and decommissioning nuclear reactors. The Corps was able to engineer a working, well balanced team by utilizing the strong Project Management system in the Huntington District. Huntington maintained and balanced a team from the Buffalo, Kansas City, Louisville and New England Districts and the HTRW-CX. This team was made up of key people who led the Corps' efforts to decommission the Army's Research Reactor in Watertown, Massachusetts, and who provided support on the decommissioning efforts for the U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) Hanford C-Reactor and Argonne's Chicago Pile-5 Reactor.

In addition, the Corps was able to reach outside its boundaries to the Department of Energy's National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL), which is the DOE's lead agency for decommissioning the nation's nuclear weapons complex. NETL maintains the DOE's largest repository of decontamination and decommissioning technology and promotes the smooth integration of validated new technology to achieve the most efficient and cost effective decontamination and decommissioning methods. This access to expertise, coupled with the Huntington District's organization and connectivity created a smooth running process.

In November 1999, these concise efforts led to the Corps' completion of the Decommissioning Plan and providing it to NASA on time and within budget. NASA has sent the Plan to the NRC for review and approval, which will take about a year. In the meantime, the Corps is planning for execution of the Plan and decontamination and decommissioning of the reactor, which is expected to cost $160 million and span 5 years.

Through strong project management and teaming, the Huntington District was able to draw upon the expertise throughout, and beyond the Corps. The team's commitment to cooperation and quality has allowed it to meet the challenges of this large and important mission. It is decommissioning projects like this one that will position the Corps to be the nation's leader in future decommissioning work. §

A NEW PARTNERSHIP FOR THE CORPS:

THE NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION

Case Study #2: Quaker Neck Dam Removal, NC

Third in a Series

By Cheree Peterson, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, EMAIL: peterson@nfwf.org

The National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (Foundation) is excited by the possibilities of working with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' (Corps) as the Corps fulfills its environmental mission. Since the Corps has a variety of authorities that coincide with the Foundation's mission of conserving fish, wildlife, and plants, the Foundation hopes to support the Corps' restoration work (please see SEP/OCT 1999 newsletter for background on the Foundation).

One partnership the Foundation would like to develop further with the Corps is partnering with the Corps and a local sponsor to perform small, low-head dam removal or to create fish passages over existing dams. The Foundation recently created a program to target the removal of low-head dams that are unsafe, under-functioning, or who's purpose is no longer relevant. Called the Dams and Rivers Program, the program funded five such projects in the first half of FY2000 and plans to fund several more in the second half of FY2000. Despite the newness of the program, the Foundation funded over thirty fish passage and dam removal projects over the past several years. Not surprisingly, the Foundation funded several dam removals with local groups that the Corps also participated in, and the Foundation would like to pursue this type of partnership.

One exemplary dam removal project that both the Foundation and the Corps played vital roles in was the removal of Quaker Neck Dam on the Neuse River in North Carolina. The Quaker Neck Dam blocked fish passage for herring, shad, and striped bass, and removing the dam opened up 139 miles of spawning habitat. North Carolina Power and Light owned the

dam and would not allow removal unless an alternative source of water could be found. The Corps' Wilmington District played a key role by developing, at the request of the US Fish and Wildlife Service, a unique mechanism to deliver water to Power and Light that would not be a barrier to fish. Without the Corps' expertise, the dam never would have been removed. The Foundation played an essential role by providing $97,000 to the North Carolina Coastal Federation to fund demolition of the dam. This $97,000 was matched in third party, non-federal funds by the North Carolina Fisheries Commission. Along with the hard work of other partners, such as the US Fish and Wildlife Service, the dam removal began on 17 December 1997 and concluded in September 1998.

While the Foundation and the Corps did not work directly with each other on this removal, both played crucial roles that made the removal possible. The Foundation would like to explore this type of partnership with the Corps through the Dams and Rivers Program. We believe the Corps' expertise can be of chief importance in small, low-head dam removal, and would like to engage this expertise wherever possible. §

ARTICLES OF INTEREST

Other article(s) that may be of interest to you:

1. From the magazine, Civil Engineering for December 1999.
   a. "The New Commute", by Laurie Shuster.

2. From the magazine, PM Network for December 1999. Located at the following URL: http://www.pmi.org/publictn/pmnetworkonline
   a. "Team Accountability", by Paula Martin & Karen Tate.
   b. "Ethics, Leadership, and your Family Room Sofa", by Bud Baker.
   c. "Duties of the Effective Resource Manager", by Neal Whitten.
   d. "You Owe Your Project Players a Communication Infrastructure - Part 2", by Joan Knutson.
   e. "Operational Measurements for Product Development Organizations - Part 2.
   f. "A Strategic Weapon", by Tony Rizzo.
   g. "Take the Path That is Really Critical", by Eric Uyttewaal.
   h. "Risk Assessment: Learning the Hard Way", by Richard Shepherd.
   i. "The Juggler's Guide to Managing Multiple Projects", by Michael Dobson.

3. From the magazine, Project Management Journal for December 1999.
   a. Duck Alignment Theory: Going Beyond Classic Project Management to Maximize Project Success", by Derek Lidow. §

This publication is located at the following URLs:
HTTP://WWW.USACE.ARMY.MIL/INET/FUNCTIONS/CW/CECWB/NEWS **or**
HTTP://WWW.HQ.USACE.ARMY.MIL/CEMP/M/MR/NWSLTR/NWINDX.HTM

YOU MAY CONTRIBUTE ARTICLES OR PROVIDE SUGGESTIONS FOR ARTICLES TO EITHER:

MR. EDWARD P. RACHT, CEMP-MP, 202-761-8816
OR MR. BRAD PRICE, CECW-BD, 202-761-1116.

Programs Management News is an unofficial publication published in accordance with AR 25-30, The Army Integrated Publishing and Printing Program. It is published by the HQ, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Office of Deputy Commanding General for Civil Works and Office of Deputy Commanding General for Military Programs, Programs Management Division, 20 Massachusettes Ave., NW, Washington D.C., 20314-1000. §

CONTRIBUTORS

MR. STEVE BROWNING ..... CEMP-M
MR. FRED CAVER ..... CECW-B
MARK D. KESSINGER ..... CELRH-PM-P
MS. CHEREE PETERSON ..... NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION